

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 18, 2005. Claims 45, 46, 48, 49, and 51 to 68 are pending in the application, of which Claims 45, 48, 52 and 66 to 68 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 45, 46, 48, 49, and 51 to 65 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,228,118 (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,580,177 (Gase). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns detecting printers in a network and determining their capabilities. In regard to printer languages, an apparatus in accordance with the present invention determines if a printer language supported by the printer is not distinguishable. If so, the apparatus displays information indicating that the printer is available but that the apparatus was unable to determine what printer languages are supported by the printer.

As amended, independent Claim 45 is directed to an information processing apparatus including a determiner adapted to determine a presence or an absence of a printer connected to the network by sending an inquiry. An inquiry circuit is adapted to make an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network by sending the inquiry about the printer language to the network and a receiver is adapted to receive information about the printer language supported by the printer, wherein the information about the printer language is sent in response to the inquiry about the printer language. A displaying circuit is adapted to display information that the printer language supported by the printer is not distinguishable when the determiner determines the presence of the printer and the receiver does not receive the printer language supported by the printer.

In contrast, Sasaki, discloses to a printer system wherein one of the printer drivers through which print data is sent from a data processor to a printer is selected based on interpreters available on the printer. Sasaki also discloses displaying an identification number of a selected, compatible printer (i.e., a printer having a compatible language interpreter), and displaying an alarm message if none of the printers, for example LP1, LP2, has a compatible interpreter. (Sasaki, column 10, lines 10 to 54.) Therefore, Sasaki discloses that a response must be received from the printer before compatibility between drivers and interpreters can be determined. Sasaki is entirely silent on what happens when a printer is available yet is not able to provide information about its interpreter.

Furthermore, Gase discloses a printer administration utility 28 that enables a file server 16 to indicate to each client processor a list of available printers or plotters found on the network. This is accomplished by providing a modular I/O card 30 (which is part of each printer or plotter) that periodically “advertises” its related printer’s or plotter’s availability by the transmission of messages to file server 16. This data is accumulated within file server 16 and enables the generation of display presentation 50 at a client processor. This data is displayed on display screen presentation 50 in response to a user’s request to show available printers. From the display screen presentation 50, the user selects a particular printer. Upon selecting the printer, a status box 56 automatically indicates an availability status of the selected printer. The status of the selected printer is indicated by traffic light-like icon 58 which displays either red, yellow, or green lights, depending upon the status of the selected printer and the intervening network. (Gase, column 4, line 35, to column 5, line 12.)

Applicants submit that, even if Sasaki be deemed to refer to displaying a printer identification number or an alarm, and even if Gase be deemed to refer to selecting from available printers, nothing has been found in either Sasaki or Gase et al. that would teach or suggest displaying information that the printer language supported by the printer is not distinguishable when the determiner determines the presence of the printer and the receiver does not receive the printer language supported by the printer, as recited in Claim 45. As such, even if Sasaki and Gase were to be combined (which in any event, is not admitted would have been obvious or technically feasible), the resulting combination also would not teach or suggest those features of Claim 45.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended Claim 45 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Amended independent Claims 48 and 51 are directed to a method and a computer-readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with Claim 45. Therefore, Applicants submit that the discussion from above in regard to Claim 45 applies equally to Claims 48 and 51. Accordingly, Claims 48 and 51 are believed to be in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request same.

New independent Claims 66, 67 and 68 are directed to an apparatus, a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, including the feature of displaying information that the printer language supported by the printer is not distinguishable when the presence of the printer is detected and the obtaining step does not obtain the printer language supported by the printer. Therefore, Applicants submit that the discussion from above in regard to Claim 45 applies equally to Claims 66, 67 and 68. Accordingly, Claims 66, 67 and 68 are believed to be in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request same.

The other claims in this application each depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, Applicants submit each dependent claim is also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons. However, as each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 97767v1